



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/589,712

08/17/2006

J. Michael Lucas

06005/41111

8803

45372

7590

06/08/2010

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP (FISHER)
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
6300 WILLIS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHILLIP H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2191

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/08/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/589,712	Applicant(s) LUCAS ET AL.	
	Examiner Phillip H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :20070122,20090310,20090813,20091211,20100312.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the original filing date of 8/17/2006
2. Claims 1-43 are pending in this application and have been considered below.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/22/2007, 3/10/2009, 8/13/2009, 12/11/2009, and 3/23/2010 have being considered by the examiner. All cited documents identified as "International Search Report", "Examination Report", "Translation of First Office Action for corresponding Chinese Application", and "Second Office Action for corresponding Chinese Application" submitted by the applicant are considered by the examiner. However, these cited documents are official documents that are sent to the applicant in response to examination of patent applications and cannot be listed in a printed patent publication. An initial of the examiner will cause these cited documents to be listed in the printed patent publication and therefore, a strikethrough of these cited document is applied.

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

Art Unit: 2191

5. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

6. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

9. Claim 1 recites "a graphic display editor" which is directed to software per se. Therefore, the claim is not directed to patent-eligible subject matter categories (Process, Machine, Manufacture, and Composition of Matter). Claims 2-15 directly or indirectly depend on claim 1 and therefore are rejected for failing to cure the deficiencies of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2191

10. Claim 16 recites "a set of graphic displays" which is directed to software per se. Therefore, the claim is not directed to patent-eligible subject matter categories (Process, Machine, Manufacture, and Composition of Matter). Claims 17-26 direct or indirectly depend on claim 16 and therefore are rejected for failing to cure the deficiencies of claim 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 20, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,442,512 to Sengupta et al. ("Sengupta").

As per claims 1 and 16

Sengupta teaches a graphic display editor for use in creating a user interface display that represents the operation of one or more entities within the process plant, the graphic display editor comprising:

a library of graphic objects, each graphic object including a visual representation of a physical or a logical entity within the process plant (see at least **FIG. 11 - "Pump, Pipe, Valve, etc."**; see also **FIG. 14 - "palette 1406"**);

a graphically based editor canvas routine that enables a user to define an executable graphic display by placing one or more visual representations of the graphic objects from the library of graphic objects onto an edit canvas to define a manner in which the one or more visual representations of the graphic objects will be displayed on a display device to a user during execution of the graphic display (see at least **FIG. 12**);

a property definition canvas routine adapted to enable a user to define a property associated with at least one of the plurality of graphic objects (see at least col. 2:25-34 **“In one preferred embodiment, a Graphical User Interface (GUI) is used to build and specify a specific flowsheet configuration, such as a process plant or refinery, as represented by a particular arrangement of process units, connecting stream, parameters, variable values, operating specification, and the like. The GUI incorporates user interface features such as tree views, drag-and-drop functionality, and tabbed windows to enhance the intuitiveness and usability of the interface”**);

a binding definition routine adapted to enable a user to specify a binding between the property and a runtime environment within the process plant (see at least col. 13:23-24 **“the plant process data (i.e. property) may be incorporated into the model in real time, as the plant process is executing”**; see also FIG. 5; see also at least col. 8:66-67 – col. 9:1-10 **“the model generator 502 creates a math model of the flowsheet for input to the solution engine 310. The math model is a large set of equations and variables which models the plant process...The math model may also contain other information, such**

Art Unit: 2191

as parameter values, and the like, used in solving or converging the math model..." – Note: The property (i.e. parameter) of the process unit binds to the runtime environment such as the solution engine 310 for solving the model); and an action definition routine adapted to enable a user to interact with the graphic display to perform a function using the graphic display (see at least col. 13:18-25 **"In accordance with one embodiment of this invention, a user may customize the flowsheet units and streams to better fit actual data associated with a plant process and thus, better model the plant process. The customized flowsheet may be used in multiple applications in open-equation mode. For example, the plant process data may be incorporated into the model in real time, as the plant process is executing"**).

As per claims 2 and 17

Sengupta teaches

wherein the action definition routine enables a user to link to a further graphic display (see at least col. 11:25-28 **"the subflowsheet 606 advantageously allows user to graphically group one or more units into a collection"** - Note: Each group/subflowsheet is considered as a further or a subsection of the flowsheet).

As per claim 3

Sengupta teaches

Art Unit: 2191

wherein the further graphic display provides information about an entity within the graphic display (see at least **FIG. 12 – Item 1216**).

As per claims 5 and 19

Sengupta teaches

wherein the graphic display illustrates a first section of the process plant and the further graphic display illustrates a second and different section of the process plant (see at least **FIG. 12 – Item 1216** – Note: Item 1216 is a collection of process units and is considered as a further/subsection of the process plant).

As per claims 6 and 20

Sengupta teaches

wherein the graphic display illustrates a first section of the process plant and the further graphic display illustrates a sub-section of the first section of the process plant (see at least **FIG. 12** – Note: Item 1216 is a subsection of the process plant).

As per claims 11 and 24

Sengupta teaches

wherein the first functional view is a maintenance view (see at least **FIG. 14**; see also col. 10:12-18 “**color codes, shading, or dashed outlines may be used to indicate the current status, including the solvability status, of a unit or a flowsheet upon the instantiation of a modification to the flowsheet...**”)

Art Unit: 2191

and the second functional view is one of a control view, or a business view or a simulation view or an engineering view (see at least **FIG. 14** – Note: Fig. 14 is a model of a plant process).

As per claims 12 and 25

Sengupta teaches

wherein the maintenance view illustrates an indication of a health or status of a physical entity within the process plant (see at least **FIG. 14**; see also col. 10:12-18 “**color codes, shading, or dashed outlines may be used to indicate the current status, including the solvability status, of a unit or a flowsheet upon the instantiation of a modification to the flowsheet...**”).

As per claim 14

Sengupta teaches

a definition routine adapted to enable a user to define a routine that effects the visual representation of one of the graphic objects based on the property during execution of the graphic display (see at least col. 10:4:8 “**The modeling engine framework 308 interacts with both the GUI 202 and the modeling engine 304, through corresponding module interfaces 204, to present to the user an intuitive environment for creating and modifying unit and flowsheet models**”).

As per claim 15

Art Unit: 2191

Sengupta teaches

wherein the definition routine enables a user to define the routine as an animation routine that animates the visual representation of the one of the graphic objects (see at least **FIG. 14**; see also col. 10:12-18 "**color codes, shading, or dashed outlines may be used to indicate the current status, including the solvability status, of a unit or a flowsheet upon the instantiation of a modification to the flowsheet...**").

13. Claims 27-43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,631,825 to van Weele et al. ("van Weele").

As per claim 27

van Weele teaches a process control and configuration system for use in a process plant, comprising:

a plurality of physical and logic process entities which operate together to perform a process (see at least **FIG. 5 "SEQUENCES/SECTIONS"**);

a process controller communicatively connected to the plurality of physical and logical process entities (see at least **FIG. 2**; see also col. 18:49-54 "**the operator station 20 of the present invention is typically utilized in a manufacturing process control system 60 including one or more dedicated process control computers (PCCs) 62-70 each of which PCCs 62-70 controls one or more SEQUENCES in a manufacturing process**");

one or more control routines implemented on the process controller to control the operation of the plurality of physical and logic process entities (see at least col. 17:63-65 **“one or more process control computers monitored and controlled through the operator station 20 interface”**);

a display device including a processor and a display screen (see at least **FIG. 2**; see also col. 17:63 **“operator station”**); and

a set of interrelated graphic displays (see at least **FIG. 5 “SEQUENCES”** and **“SECTIONS”**), wherein each of the graphic displays is executable on the display device to visually represent the operation of one or more of the process entities within the process plant on the display screen (see at least FIG. 3; see also col. 20:45-54 **“...provide the operator with an overview of the manufacturing process, Plant Overview Windows include a SECTIONS Overview Window 36, a SEQUENCES Overview Window 38...”**), wherein one of the set of interrelated graphic displays may be sequentially accessed from another one of the set of graphic displays (see at least col. 13:18-20 **“Clicking on the Flowsheet Button of a SEQUENCE Indicator causes the Master Flowsheet for that SEQUENCE to be displayed within the plant Overview Flowsheet Window”**).

As per claim 28

a graphic display editor adapted to create each of the set of interrelated graphic displays (see at least col. 22:30-32 **“Flowsheet provides the ability to create additional flowsheet window 52 on the secondary display 28...”**).

As per claim 29

van Weele teaches

wherein one of the set of interrelated graphic displays includes a display area (see at least **FIG. 3**), one or more visually interconnected graphic objects (see at least **FIG. 5**), each of the graphic objects including a visual representation of a physical or a logical entity within the process plant (see at least **FIG. 5**), a property definition defining a property associated with at least one of the plurality of graphic objects (see at least col. 2:36-40 "**It should be noted that certain elements such as, for example, variables, may be associated with more than one SEQUENCE. That is an attribute of a SEQUENCE is not necessarily uniquely associated with that SEQUENCE, but may also be an attribute of a different SEQUENCE**") and a binding definition specifying a binding between the property and a runtime environment within the process plant (see at least FIG. 5 - Note: The variables are bound to a runtime environment with the process plant in order to provide status, color, shade, etc., of the sequence).

As per claim 30

van Weele teaches

wherein the one of the set of interrelated graphic displays includes a visual link within the display area that enables a user to interact with the one of the set of interrelated graphic displays to link to the another one of the set of interrelated

Art Unit: 2191

graphic displays (see at least col. 13:18-20 “**Clicking on the Flowsheet Button** (i.e. visual link) **of a SEQUENCE Indicator causes the Master Flowsheet for that SEQUENCE to be displayed within the plant Overview Flowsheet Window**”).

As per claims 31 and 38

van Weele teaches

wherein the another one of the set of interrelated graphic displays provides information about an entity within the one of the set of interrelated graphic displays (see at least col. 13:18-20 “**Clicking on the Flowsheet Button** (i.e. visual link) **of a SEQUENCE Indicator causes the Master Flowsheet for that SEQUENCE to be displayed within the plant Overview Flowsheet Window**”).

As per claims 32 and 39

van Weele teaches

wherein the one of the set of interrelated graphic displays illustrates a first section of the process plant and the another one of the set of interrelated graphic displays illustrates a second and different section of the process plant (see at least FIG. 3; see also col. 20:45-54 “...a **SECTIONS Overview window 36, a SEQUENCES Overview window 38**” – Note: a SEQUENCES overview window is considered another one of the set of interrelated graphic displays).

As per claims 33 and 40

van Weele teaches

wherein the one of the set of interrelated graphic displays illustrates a first section of the process plant and the another one of the set of interrelated graphic displays illustrates a sub-section of the first section of the process plant (see at least (see at least col. 7:42 “**A SECTION is a logical collection of SEQUENCES**” – Note: A SEQUENCE is a subsection of a SECTION).

As per claims 34 and 41

van Weele teaches

wherein the one of the set of interrelated graphic displays illustrates a first functional view of a section of the process plant and the another one of the set of interrelated graphic displays illustrates a second function view of the section of the process plant (see at least **FIGS. 5-6** – Note: SECTION illustrates a first functional view and SEQUENCE illustrate a second functional view).

As per claims 35 and 42

van Weele teaches

wherein the first functional view is a control operator view (see at least FIG. 3; see also col. 20:45-54 “...**Plant Overview Windows, provide the operator with an overview of the manufacturing process...**”) and the second functional view is one of a maintenance view or a business view or a simulation

Art Unit: 2191

view or an engineering view (see at least col. 20:33-38 **"The operator station 20 of the present invention must, therefore, provide an operator with quick access to information relating to the status of the one or more SECTIONS and SEQUENCES of the process being monitored by that operator"** - Note: Since the operator is provided with information related to status of SECTIONS and SEQUENCES, a maintenance view is also provided to the operator).

As per claim 36

van Weele teaches a process control and configuration system for use in a process plant, comprising:

- a plurality of physical and logic process entities which operate together to perform a process (see at least **FIG. 5 "SEQUENCES/SECTIONS"**);

- a process controller communicatively connected to the plurality of physical and logical process entities (see at least **FIG. 2**; see also col. 18:49-54 **"the operator station 20 of the present invention is typically utilized in a manufacturing process control system 60 including one or more dedicated process control computers (PCCs) 62-70 each of which PCCs 62-70 controls one or more SEQUENCES in a manufacturing process"**);

- one or more control routines implemented on the process controller to control the operation of the plurality of physical and logic process entities (see at least col. 17:63-65 **"one or more process control computers monitored and controlled through the operator station 20 interface"**);

Art Unit: 2191

a display device including a processor and a display screen (see at least **FIG. 2**; see also col. 17:63 “**operator station**”); and

a graphic display editor that enables a user to create a set of interrelated graphic displays (see at least col. 22:30-32 “**Flowsheet provides the ability to create additional flowsheet window 52 on the secondary display 28...**”), wherein each of the set of interrelated graphic displays is executable on the display device to visually represent the operation of one or more of the process entities within the process plant on the display screen (see at least col. 32:1-16 “**Master SECTIONS Graphic Sheet -- as previously described, this graphics sheet shows a graphical overview of this manufacturing process relevant to all the SECTIONS assigned to the operator station...**”).

As per claim 37

van Weele teaches

wherein the graphical display editor is adapted to interrelate the graphic displays by allowing a user to specify a manner in which one of the graphic display is related to another one of the graphic displays (see at least col. 7:42 “**A SECTION is a logical collection of SEQUENCES**” – Note: A SEQUENCE is a subsection of a SECTION).

As per claim 43

van Weele teaches

wherein the first functional display is a maintenance display (see at least col. 20:33-38 **"The operator station 20 of the present invention must, therefore, provide an operator with quick access to information relating to the status of the one or more SECTIONS and SEQUENCES of the process being monitored by that operator"** - Note: Since the operator is provided with information related to status of SECTIONS and SEQUENCES, a maintenance view is also provided to the operator) and the second functional display is one of a control display or a business display or a simulation display or an engineering display (see at least col. 17:63-65 **"one or more process control computers monitored and controlled through the operator station 20 interface"**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,512 to Sengupta et al. ("Sengupta") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,931,288 to Lee et al. ("Lee").

As per claims 4 and 18

Sengupta does not explicitly teach

wherein the further graphic display is a faceplate display.

However, Lee teaches a related art includes

graphic display is a faceplate display (see at least col. 3:14-20 "**the interface may comprises a free-form text box, in which a user may embed text, links, graphics, or other information into a function block diagram, For example, the free-form text box may comprise text, OLE, objects, controls, faceplates...**").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that creating a graphic display in faceplate format is **old and well known** and to modify the teaching of Sengupta to incorporate this old and well known technique taught by Lee for the user to operate the graphic display. The modification would have been obvious because it would allow a user to monitor and control the graphic display.

16. Claims 7-10, 13, and 21-23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,512 to Sengupta et al. ("Sengupta") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,631,825 to van Weele et al. ("van Weele").

As per claims 7 and 21

Sengupta does not explicitly teach

Art Unit: 2191

wherein the graphic display illustrates the first section of the process plant at a first level of detail and the further graphic display illustrates the sub-section of the first section of the process plant at a greater level of detail than the first level of detail.

However, van Weele teaches a related art including

wherein the graphic display illustrates the first section of the process plant at a first level of detail and the further graphic display illustrates the sub-section of the first section of the process plant at a greater level of detail than the first level of detail (see at least col. 27:13-16 “**Referring now to FIG. 12, the SEQUENCES Overview Graphic Sheet 144 in SEQUENCES Overview Window 38 provides a more detailed overview of a part of the plant than the SECTIONS Overview Graphic Sheet 108 described above**” – Note: The SEQUENCE is considered as a sub-section of the SECTION).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sengupta to incorporate the teaching of van Weele to provide different level of detail of the process. The modification would have been obvious because it would provide the operator in details of the objects in the graphic display for monitoring and controlling the process plant.

As per claims 8 and 22

Art Unit: 2191

Sengupta does not explicitly teach

wherein the graphical display provides a first functional view of a section of the process plant and the further display provides a second functional view of the section of the process plant.

However, van Weele teaches

wherein the graphical display provides a first functional view of a section of the process plant and the further display provides a second functional view of the section of the process plant (see at least col. 27:13-16 "**SECTION Overview**" and "**SEQUENCE Overview**").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sengupta to incorporate the teaching of van Weele to provide two levels of view for the process plant. The modification would have been obvious because it would provide the operator in details of the objects in the graphic display for monitoring and controlling the process plant.

As per claims 9 and 23

Sengupta teaches

the second functional view is one of a maintenance view or a business view or a simulation view or an engineering view (see at least **FIG. 12** – Note: Fig. 12 is a model of plant process).

However, Sengupta does not explicitly teach
the first functional view is a control operator view.

van Weele teaches

wherein first functional view is a control operator view (see at least col.
20:48-50 “...**provide the operator with an overview of the manufacturing
process...**”

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at
the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sengupta to
incorporate the teaching of van Weele to include operator view. The modification
would have been obvious because it would provide a user with views of
operating the plant process model.

As per claim 10

van Weele teaches

wherein the control operator view illustrates process values associated
with one or more physical entities during operation of the process plant (see at
least **FIGS. 13-15**).

As per claim 13

Sengupta does not explicitly teach

wherein the action definition routine enables a user to link to a control routine display illustrating a control routine implemented within the process plant.

However, van Weele teaches

enables a user to link to a control routine display illustrating a control routine implemented within the process plant (see at least col. 18:49-54

“Referring to FIG. 2, the operator station 20 of the present invention is typically utilized in a manufacturing process control system 60 including one or more dedicated process control computers (PCCs) 62-70 each of which PCCs 62-70 controls one or more SEQUENCES in a manufacturing process”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sengupta to incorporate the teaching of van Weele to provide an operator view of the plant process. The modification would have been obvious because it would provide an operator/user to monitor and control the plant process.

As per claim 26

Sengupta does not explicitly teach

wherein the first graphic display is an operators view illustrating the operation of one or more physical entities within the process plant and the

Art Unit: 2191

second graphic display is a control module display illustrating a control routine for the one or more physical entities within the process plant.

However, Lee teaches a related art includes

wherein the first graphic display is an operators view illustrating the operation of one or more physical entities within the process plant (see at least col. 20:45-54 “... **provide the operator with an overview of the manufacturing process...**”) and the second graphic display is a control module display illustrating a control routine for the one or more physical entities within the process plant (see at least col. 18:49-54 “**Referring to FIG. 2, the operator station 20 of the present invention is typically utilized in a manufacturing process control system 60 including one or more dedicated process control computers (PCCs) 62-70 each of which PCCs 62-70 controls one or more SEQUENCES in a manufacturing process**”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sengupta to incorporate the teaching of Lee to include the operator view. The modification would have been obvious because it would allow an operator/user to monitor and control the plant process.

Correspondence Information

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

18. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

19. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2191

/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191